

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GREGORY LYNN NORWOOD,  
CDC #J-53407,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEANNE WOODFORD, M.E.  
BOURLAND, J.G. GIURBINO, J.A.  
JANDA,

Defendant.

Civil No. 07-0057 WQH (JMA)

**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION**

**[Doc. No. 17]**

Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, California and proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 8, 2007. In Plaintiff's original Complaint, he alleges that he was placed in administrative segregation ("ad-seg") while incarcerated at Calipatria State Prison in violation of his Fourteenth Amendment due process rights. Plaintiff also alleged that Calipatria prison officials violated his Eighth Amendment rights when they deprived him of outdoor exercise for a lengthy period of time. Plaintiff sought declaratory and injunctive relief as well as monetary damages.

////

1 Plaintiff did not prepay the civil filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a), but instead  
2 submitted a Motion to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) [Doc.  
3 No. 3]. On March 15, 2007, this Court granted Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed IFP but  
4 simultaneously dismissed his Complaint for failing to state a claim upon which relief could be  
5 granted. *See* Mar. 15, 2007 Order at 8-9. Nonetheless, the Court granted Plaintiff forty five  
6 days to submit a First Amended Complaint correcting the deficiencies of pleading noted in the  
7 Court’s Order. *Id.* at 9. On April 16, 2007, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint  
8 (“FAC”).

9 After reviewing Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, the Court specifically found that  
10 Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claim survived sua sponte screening required by 28 U.S.C.  
11 §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b), and that Plaintiff was therefore automatically entitled to U.S.  
12 Marshal service on his behalf. Plaintiff has now filed a “Motion for Clarification” regarding  
13 whether or not his First Amendment retaliation claim was dismissed.

14 The Court has not dismissed any claims or Defendants listed in Plaintiff’s First Amended  
15 Complaint at this time. However, Plaintiff is cautioned that “the sua sponte screening and  
16 dismissal procedure is cumulative of, and not a substitute for, any subsequent Rule 12(b)(6)  
17 motion that [a defendant] may choose to bring.” *Teahan v. Wilhelm*, 481 F.Supp.2d 1115, 1119  
18 (S.D. Cal. 2007). Plaintiff is required to follow the instructions that were sent to him with the  
19 Court’s Order on May 1, 2007 and prepare the U.S. Marshal Forms to serve the named  
20 Defendants. Based on a review of the Court’s docket, it does not appear that Plaintiff has  
21 effected service on any of the named Defendants.

22 Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that “[i]f service of the summons  
23 and complaint is not made upon the defendant within 120 days after the filing of the complaint,  
24 the court, upon motion or on its own initiative after notice to the plaintiff, shall dismiss the  
25 action without prejudice as to that defendant or direct that service be effected within a specified  
26 time; provided that if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court shall extend time  
27 for service for an appropriate period.” FED.R.CIV.P. 4(m).

28 ///

1 ///

2 Here, after receiving this Court's May 1, 2007 Order and a blank U.S. Marshal Form 285  
3 for each Defendant, Plaintiff appeared to be confused by the Court's Order. Accordingly, the  
4 Court finds there is good cause to grant Plaintiff an extension of time to complete the U.S.  
5 Marshal Form 285 for each named Defendant and forward them to the U.S. Marshal for service.

6 **III. Conclusion and Order**

7 Good cause appearing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

8 Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification [Doc. No. 17] is **GRANTED** and the Court will sua  
9 sponte **GRANT** Plaintiff an extension of time pursuant to FED.R.CIV.P. 4(m) to effect service  
10 of his First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff must submit his U.S. Marshal Form 285 to the U.S.  
11 Marshal as previously instructed for each named Defendant within 30 days from the date this  
12 Order is filed. The U.S. Marshal shall, within 30 days of receiving Plaintiff's U.S. Marshal  
13 Form 285, effect service of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and summons upon Defendants,  
14 as directed by Plaintiff on the U.S. Marshal Form 285 previously provided to him.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 DATED: July 31, 2007

17   
18 **WILLIAM Q. HAYES**  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28